Mail To: California Department of Water Resources

Office of Water Use Efficiency

P.O. Box 942836

Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Attn: Marsha Prillwitz

OR

Overnight Carrier or Hand

Deliver To: California Department of Water Resources

Office of Water Use Efficiency 1416 Ninth Street, Room 338 Sacramento, CA 95814 Attn: Marsha Prillwitz

Due: 3:00 p.m., March 1, 2002

Proposal: DWR Water Use Efficiency Project

Proposal Submittal

CD-ROM in MS Word.

From: Southern California Water Company,

a subsidiary of American States Water Company

Region II

1920 W. Corporate Way Anaheim, CA 92801

Applicant's Project No. 2002 B GWO 25001418

Installation of 1,570 feet \pm of 8" ductile iron water main and appurtenances to close (loop) presently dead end water mains in Manhattan Beach Blvd. at the northerly ends of Eastwood, Saylor, Osage, Avis and Rixford Avenues, City of Lawndale.

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP Proposal Part One: A. Project Information Form

1. Applying for:	plying for: \boxtimes (c) DWR Water Use Efficiency Project	
Principal applicant (Organization or affiliation):	Southern California Water Company, a subsidiary of American States Water Company	
3. Project Title:	Applicant's Project No. 2002 B GWO 25001418	
	Installation of 1,570 feet + of 8" ductile iron water main and appurtenances to close (loop) presently dead end water mains in Manhattan Beach Blvd. at the northerly ends of Eastwood, Saylor, Osage, Avis and Rixford Avenues, City of Lawndale.	
4. Person authorized to sign and submit proposal:	Name, title	Denise Kruger Vice President, Customer Service, Region II
	Mailing address	1920 W. Corporate Way Anaheim, CA 92801
	Telephone	(714) 535-7711 ext. 200
	Fax.	(714) 535-8616
	E-mail	dlkruger@scwater.com
5. Contact person (if different):	Name, title.	Denise Kruger Vice President, Customer Service, Region II
	Mailing address.	
	Telephone	Anaheim, CA 92801 (714) 535-7711 ext. 200
	Fax.	(714) 535-8616
	E-mail	dlkruger@scwater.com
6. Funds requested (dollar amount):		\$ 335,280
7. Applicant funds pledged (dollar amount):		\$ -0-
8. Total project costs (dollar amount):		\$ 335,280

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP Proposal Part One:

A. Project Information Form (continued)

9. Estimated total quantifiable project benefits (dollar amount): Percentage of benefit to be accrued by applicant:	\$ 392,500 50%*
Percentage of benefit to be accrued by CALFED or others:	50%*
10. Estimated annual amount of water to be saved (acre-f	feet): 10.07 Ac. Ft.
Estimated total amount of water to be saved (acre-feet	503.3 Ac. Ft.
Over years	50 years
Estimated benefits to be realized in terms of water quastream flow, other:	ality, in 100 %±: Reduction of Water Wastage and Water Quality and Environment Improvements
11. Duration of project (month/year to month/year):	4/02 – 8/03
12. State Assembly District where the project is to be cond	
13. State Senate District where the project is to be conduc	eted: 25
14. Congressional district(s) where the project is to be con-	iducted: 36
15. County where the project is to be conducted:	County of Los Angeles
16. Date most recent Urban Water Management Plan subr to the Department of Water Resources:	mitted 12/29/2000
* Paged on average blond of water used in avetem for flue	ching of dood and mains

^{*} Based on average blend of water used in system for flushing of dead end mains. Blend averages 50% groundwater, 50% imported water from Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP Proposal Part One:

A. Project Information Form (continued)

17. Type of applicant (select one): Prop 13 Urban Grants and Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grants:	 ☐ (a) city with Contractor, Southern California Water Company ☐ (b) county with Contractor, Southern California Water Company ☐ (c) city and county ☐ (d) joint power authority
	 (e) other political subdivision of the State, including public water district (f) incorporated mutual water company
DWR WUE Projects: the above entities (a) through (f) or:	 ⋈ (g) investor-owned utility ⋈ (h) non-profit organization ⋈ (i) tribe ⋈ (j) university ⋈ (k) state agency ⋈ (l) federal agency
18. Project focus:	☐ (a) agricultural ☐ (b) urban
19. Project type (select one): Prop 13 Urban Grant or Prop 13 Agricultural Feasibility Study Grant	(a) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices
capital outlay project related to:	(b) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices
	(c) implementation of QuantifiableObjectives (include QO number(s)
	See Note 1 on page 6
	(d) other (specify)

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP Proposal Part One: Project Information Form (continued)

DWR WUE Project related to:	 ☐ (e) implementation of Urban Best Management Practices ☐ (f) implementation of Agricultural Efficient Water Management Practices ☒ (g) implementation of Quantifiable Objectives (include QO number(s)) See Note 1 on page 6 ☐ (h) innovative projects (initial investigation of new technologies, methodologies, approaches, or institutional frameworks) ☐ (i) research or pilot projects ☐ (j) education or public information programs ☐ (k) other (specify)
Do the actions in this proposal involve physical changes in land use, or potential future changes in land use?	☐ (a) yes ☑ (b) no
	If yes, the applicant must complete the CALFED PSP Land Use Checklist found at http://calfed.water.ca.gov/environmental_docs.html and submit it with the proposal.

Note 1:

The water system of the Southern California Water Company (SCWC), which serves this community, has a number of dead end water mains. The various qualities of the water supply, presently a blend of local ground water and imported water received from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, tend to stagnate in the existing water mains to form an interior environmental condition that imparts what appears to the customer to be water with a stale taste and a noxious odor in the water supply at the point of delivery to the residences and businesses.

This results in customer dissatisfaction with the delivered water supply that as a liquid meets all Federal and State Drinking Water Standards.

SCWC, to mitigate this environmental condition, uses a combination of injected chemical treatment and flushing of the dead end water mains on a routine schedule. The chemical usages cost adds to the expense of delivery of water to the community. The flushing program in addition to being an expense, wastes water and causes movement within the pipeline system of any fine particles of sand and other matter found in the water into the customer's premises plumbing.

It is believed by SCWC that the installation of a new pipeline installation made with cement mortar lined ductile iron pipe to close (loop) the dead ends into a circulating system that will have a minimum fifty (50) year service life will produce resultant cost and water supply quantity savings (converted into dollars) resulting from a reduction in flushing by SCWC will give an improvement in water quality at a minimum of a 100% local benefit for this project.

Consolidated Water Use Efficiency 2002 PSP Proposal Part One B. Signature Page

By signing below, the official declares the following:			
The truthfulness of a	all representations in the proposal;		
The individual signing the form is authorized to submit the proposal on behalf of the applicant; and			
The individual signing the form read and understood the conflict of interest and confidentiality section and waives any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant.			
Signature	Denise Kruger Vice President, Customer Service Region II	Date _	2/28/02

Proposal Part Two:

Project Summary

A. Nature, scope and objective of the project.

This project is to install a new cement mortar lined ductile iron pipe to loop the existing dead end water pipes. This project will permit circulating water flow in the system and thereby is intended to reduce unrecoverable water losses resulting from routine flushing of the pipe system, improve water quality by the installation (looping) of new mains to eliminate the dead ends to attain environmental benefits all through water use efficiency measures with the benefits accruing to the customers served from the existing pipeline system in the community by providing them a fresh non-stagnate water supply at improved flow and pressure.

The water main installation project description, footage and cost is given on Exhibit "A" enclosed herewith.

B. Scope of work: Technical/Scientific Merit, Feasibility, Monitoring and Assessment

1. Methods, procedures and facilities.

The methods to be used to install the new ductile iron pipeline are the standard procedures used throughout California, generally involving open excavation of the public street or right of way, installation of the pipeline, and appurtenances, interconnections to the existing water. The excavation is backfilled and street pavement and other surface improvements are replaced in kind all to the standards, rules, regulations and permits of the local jurisdiction, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the State of California Department of Health Services (DOHS). All construction work would be done by a State of California licensed Contractor retained under a competitive bidding process and contract. Overall plans and specifications, preparation, supervision, inspection and project management would be done by the Southern California Water Company, the local water purveyor which is an investor owned utility operating under a franchise granted by the local jurisdiction and permits and certificates issued by DOHS and CPUC.

Task list and Schedule.

		Calendar Da	ys & Date
a.	Receipt of Funding Authorization from DWR	Start Date – Day 1	4/15/02
b.	Five day appeal process ends	Day 6	4/24/02
C.	Contract negotiations begin	Day 13	5/1/02
d.	Contract executed, project begins	Day 166 (1)	10/1/02
e.	Preparation of plans and specifications	Days 167 – 252 (84)	10/2/02-1/8/03
f.	Bidding of project	Days 253 – 286 (33)	1/9/03 – 2/10/03
g.	Award of project and execution of contract to low bid qualified Contractor	Days 287 – 312 (25)	2/11/03 – 3/7/03
h.	Issue Notice to Proceed to Contractor	Days 313 – 322 (10)	3/8/03 – 3/17/03
i.	Pre-Construction Meeting	Day 323 (1)	3/18/03
j.	Contractor Mobilization	Days 324 – 338 (14)	3/19/03 – 4/2/03
k.	Construction (60 working days)	Days 339 – 423 (84)	4/3/03 – 7/10/03
I.	Beginning of improved water quality service	Day 423 (1)	7/11/03
m.	Processing of final invoice and acceptance of Contractor's work	Days 423 – 453 (31)	7/11/03 – 8/11/03
n.	Close out of agreement with DWR	Days 454 – 501 (7)	8/12/03 – 8/19/03

C. Qualifications of the Applicant's and Cooperators.

This jurisdiction has been incorporated for many years as a governmental corporation governed by elected officials and managed by professional staff. The local jurisdiction does not presently own or operate a water distribution system to serve the area within the Southern California Water Company's certificated Service Area. The Southern California Water Company (SCWC) is an investor owned water distribution company and is a subsidiary of the American States Water Company, a stock corporation listed on the New York Stock Exchange. SCWC has been operating water distribution systems throughout the State of California since 1929, and is one of the largest water distribution systems locally and nationally. SCWC is managed by professional staff. SCWC has provided water service to this community for many years as a public utility regulated by the State of California Public Utilities Commission operating pursuant to rules and regulations of the State of California Department of Health Services. Potable water service is provided by SCWC.

D. Benefits and Costs

The cost of this project is contained on Exhibit "A" enclosed herewith.

The benefits of this project are accomplished by the installation of new ductile iron water main and appurtenances to complete the looping of presently dead end water mains.

The water main replacement will:

- permit a reduction in flushing of the water system thereby reducing the quantity of water wasted to the local storm drain system and to better comply with latest NPDES regulations.
- eliminate the stagnation of the water supply in the dead end pipes. The stagnate waters tend to have taste and odor problems which cause customer concerns.
- eliminate the stagnate waters from entering the customer's water supply and premises piping system.
- eliminate the need for the customer to regularly flush their plumbing system to obtain a clear-odor free water supply thereby reducing the wastage of water and reducing the customer's water bill.
- provide an aesthetically environmentally pleasing water supply for the served customers.
- increase customers confidence in the safeness of the water supply delivered by the water purveyor.
- eliminate the impact on the water service to customers during the routine flushing process.
- eliminate the flushing programs impact on the water quality in the system during and after the flushing.
- allow the customer to make more efficient use of the water supply.
- reduce the wastage of water to the local sewer system as customers do not have to flush their premises water systems.
- reduce the quantity of water wasted to the local storm drain system and the quantity of street gutter debris washed into the storm drain system as the flushing program is underway.

The average cost of a typical new 8" water main project including appurtenances is \$219 per foot.
The anticipated minimum age of the new replacement water main is 50 years.
The estimated quantity of water wasted in flushing the existing dead end water main over the 50 years is 1/3 of an acre foot per foot of new pipe installed to loop dead ends.
The average present day customer cost of the blended groundwater and imported water supply in Region II is \$750 per acre foot. The cost for 1/3 acre foot is \$250. Therefore for each foot of new pipe installed to loop dead ends there will be a \$250 benefit versus a \$219 cost, a positive benefit of \$31 per foot of new water main over installation cost.

The above indicated hard cash savings over the 50-year period does not have any assignment of monetary values to many customer and environmental benefits listed herein.

Should one assign monetary values to such other benefits listed herein, the positive benefit is anticipated to increase from the \$31 per foot of new replacement water main to over \$100 per foot.

E. Outreach, Community Involvement and Acceptance

For each project whether done under the Proposition 13 Urban Water Conservation Grant program (A) or the DWR Water Use Efficiency Project (B), SCWC, the local water purveyor will be working with the administration of the local jurisdiction (City or County) to notify the public, residents and businesses of the project and its benefits by advertisement in the local media, press releases and through lines of communication commonly used by the local jurisdiction.

The benefits, particularly the reduction in the quantity of water used (wasted) to flush the dead end water mains, the improvement in water quality and the environmental improvements would be identified in all such communications.

Εı	nc	logi	ire.

Exhibit "A"